563 to impress even the most unreflecting sight-seer is the medley of ethnic groups. What is almost equally apparent
563 is that these ethnic groups do not mix. Each has its own
• 571 quarter, its own temple, its club or other meeting ground for social functions, its own forms and places of entertainment and recreation. They do not meet in these places but only in the market place to make money out of one another or perhaps with one another. They have no common link except in business. What is not quite obvious is that each ethnic group has its own special economic function. There is a plural society with its own distinctive and characteristic plural economy.

563 Typically, a plural society in Southeast Asia com-
565 prises three main sections: the Europeans, constituting an
433 upper class; the foreign orientals, Indian or Chinese, consti-
571 tuting a middle class; and the great mass of the native population in the lower class. The Europeans and foreign orientals are temporary residents, strangers to one another or at best casual acquaintances, and the native community is little more than a crowd of individuals. In the relations between the classes, there are no social ties to dull the edge of economic competition. Within each class, inherited traditions lose their force. Society as a whole is divided into groups; each group is merely a collection of individuals, and in each group life is simplified to an economic struggle for existence. Social life is reduced to its economic content, society is converted into a business concern, and only the

7: Janlekha X-4,5 (1948-1953) 1956 AO7 Central Thai
Southeast Asia AL1

563 foreign army of occupation has preserved it from disruption.
565 The essential and distinctive character of a plural society
433 is that it is dominated by economic forces, and, outside a
• 591 few partly sheltered oases, Southeast Asia illustrates the capitalist system in its purest form.[18]

162 Another common feature is the dominance of the agri-
171 cultural section of the population. The latest available
433 figures show the percentage proportions of population dependent
171 on agriculture in the area as follows: Burma, 68; Indonesia, 66; Philippines, 69; Thailand, 85.[19] The same source indicates the proportions for various regions of the world as follows: North America, 20; Oceania, 30; Europe, 33; South America, 60; Asia, 70; and Africa, 74.

171 With the prevailing techniques of production and the
433 consequent low productivity per man, dominance of agriculture
434 means low per capita national income. When countries are grouped by level of economic development on the basis of per capita national income as of 1950, all the six countries of Southeast Asia -- Burma, Indo-China, Indonesia, Malaya, Philippines, and Thailand -- fall in the underdeveloped
443 group.[20] Moreover, there is in Southeast Asia a true surplus
464 population on the land in the sense that even under the
161 present methods of cultivation a sizeable fraction of the

---

18. Ibid., p. 77.

19. Food and Agriculture Organization, 1953 Yearbook, Vol. VII.

20. Eugene Staley, The Future of Underdeveloped Countries (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954), pp. 16-17.